

Radical Abolitionist.

"PROCLAIM LIBERTY THROUGHOUT ALL THE LAND, UNTO ALL THE INHABITANTS THEREOF."—LEV. XXV. 10.

VOLUME II.]

NEW YORK, MARCH, 1857.

[NUMBER 8.]

The Radical Abolitionist.

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor.

Is Published Monthly,

AT 48 BEEKMAN STREET, NEW YORK.

BY THE AMERICAN ABOLITION SOCIETY.

Terms.

PER ANNUM, OR FOR TWELVE NUMBERS.

SINGLE COPIES.....	\$0.50
FIVE COPIES directed to one person.....	2.00
EIGHT COPIES, do. do.	3.00
FOURTEEN COPIES, do. do.	5.00
THIRTY COPIES, do. do.	10.00

Payments in advance.

All letters must be post-paid.

Small change, or sums less than one dollar, may be sent in post-office stamps; or, if stamps cannot be procured, one dollar may be sent, and the balance will be sent back in stamps deducting postage.

OBJECTIONS AGAINST RADICAL ABOLITIONISTS AND THEIR MEASURES.

REVIEW OF THE OBERLIN EVANGELIST.

We are always glad to have a good opportunity to consider and discuss the objections that are raised against us, and against the principles and measures we advocate. And when objections more or less current in the community are gathered up and repeated, in consecutive form, by so respectable and influential a Journal as the Oberlin Evangelist, we need make no apology for taking up those objections, one by one, at leisure, and devoting to them the attention and the space that the important interests involved demand.

The Oberlin Evangelist of Jan. 21, devotes above two columns to the "uncharitable and unfraternal charges" of "some of those who take the name of Radical Abolitionists," and to a "protest" against some of their supposed errors—We welcome the Evangelist, most fraternally, to a discussion of whatever matters of difference there may be between us, in respect to Abolition, and regret that any thing that has appeared in our paper or in private letters (which the Editor says he has received,) should have been understood as having an uncharitable bearing. Of the "private letters," of which he speaks, we can, of course, have had no knowledge, and are not responsible for them. If we can be shown wherein we have wronged any one, or have been "uncharitable," or have imbibed any errors, we shall be happy to have our faults pointed out, that we may make due amends and retractions. Or if, on the other hand, we have maintained only the truth, and uttered no censures that were not required by fidelity to a righteous cause, we must have the opportunity of showing that it is so.

"UNCHARITABLENESS OF ABOLITIONISTS."

Without further preface, we proceed to copy the article of the Evangelist entire, and in order,

only cutting it up into parcels, for the convenience of interspersing our remarks by the side of the text, that the two may appear together. The Evangelist begins thus:

"A FEW WORDS TO ANTI-SLAVERY MEN.—All Anti-slavery men should be brethren. Agreeing in the one great sentiment of opposition to slavery, they have most cogent reasons for tolerating in each other a large difference of opinion on minor questions pertaining to the subject."

This opening paragraph is the key note to much that follows. While we readily respond to the sentiment, yet the connection in which it stands, and the uses it seems to subserve, reminds us, irresistibly, of similar articles in respect to Temperance measures from 1827 to 1834, when teetotallers encountered, first, the Old Massachusetts Temperance Society, that proposed no pledge, and only advocated "moderation in the use of intoxicating drinks," and second, the American Temperance Society which proposed a pledge from ardent spirits, or distilled liquors, only, not including wine, beer, and cider. The teetotallers were blamed as wanting in charitableness and fraternal fellowship for other friends of Temperance, and in almost the identical language of the Evangelist, (indelibly impressed by repetition upon our memory) we were told—"All Temperance men should be brethren. Agreeing in the one great sentiment of opposition to intemperance, they have the most cogent reasons for tolerating in each other, a large difference of opinions on minor questions pertaining to the subject." And this was continuously urged, for seven long years, as a reason why teetotallers should not organize, by themselves, on the principle of total abstinence from all intoxicating liquors, nor cease co-operation with the Old Societies whose want of efficiency had been demonstrated, nor urge teetotalism as vital to the principle and the practice of true Temperance.

The error of these appeals (which met our ears and our eyes, thousands of times) lay—not in the sentiment of brotherly love and toleration, but in the notion that these were violated by teetotallers in expressing their honest convictions, and in being true to their convictions, in the corresponding measures pursued by them. The error included likewise the assumption, without proof, that the distinctive principles and measures of teetotallers were "minor questions" and not vital, in the very nature of things, to the cause.—The Evangelist proceeds—

"For (1.) To a man they hold to free thought and free speech. Why should they not apply these principles—so emphatically *their own*—to their own mutual relations.

"Yet, further—while the world stands, free thought and speech will beget diversity of opinion on minor points." If the great points of Christian duty becomes

an exception—and we believe they will in 'the good time coming'—we shall owe it to the harmonizing influence of universal love. But this same love will sweetly tolerate minor differences then; why should not it now?

"Let us take care, lest, in encroaching on the right of free thought and speech among ourselves, we endorse the very spirit of that slavery which we profess to discard and oppose."

Yes! We do indeed "hold to free thought and free speech." Does the Evangelist suppose that we fail to "apply these principles, so emphatically *our own*, to our own mutual relations"—simply because we have freely exercised "free thought and free speech?" Have we done any thing more? Have we ever complained of the Evangelist, or of any body else, for exercising "free thought and free speech?"—The Evangelist freely points out what it regards as being wrong in us—our "uncharitable and unfraternal" course—our false theories of government which would be "usurpation and might work great mischief"—and "would probably lead to civil war."—Against these alleged faults and errors, the Evangelist, repeatedly and earnestly "enters (its) protest."—Very good. It is the Evangelist's privilege of "free thought and free speech" to think and say so. And have we uttered a syllable against it? No, and we shall not. We shall not even complain that it was "uncharitable and unfraternal," in the Evangelist, to think and say so. We do not think that it was. We think our brother, of the Evangelist, was perfectly justifiable in forming and expressing his own opinion, in the premises. And now we ask whether the Evangelist will not exercise the same "toleration" towards us in respect to our forming and expressing *our* beliefs? If, in the honest use of the best lights within our reach, we find ourselves compelled to believe that it is a great moral wrong against the slave, against the nation, against human nature, and against God, for the voters and the rulers of this professedly free and Christian nation, to refuse, or to defer, for four years longer, the liberation of the enslaved, nay, to pledge themselves, indefinitely, to let slavery alone in the States where it exists (which includes nearly all slavery there is in the country) is it not our duty to say so? Is it not our duty to "enter our protest" against it? Is it "uncharitable and unfraternal" in us to do so? Or must we conclude that views of the Constitution too favorable to abolition, and the "uncharitableness" of remonstrating with those who vote against a national abolition of our great national sin and disgrace, are the only errors of sufficient magnitude, in a day like this, to be "protested" against?

"Yet further, while the world stands," says

the Evangelist, "free thought and free speech will beget diversity of opinion on minor points."—If this be true, then, "while the world stands" *there must be* "free thought and free speech," on the points of disagreement, all complaints of "uncharitableness" notwithstanding, otherwise "free speech" must be sacrificed to promote charity. Precisely here it is, that "toleration" is needed. It is always under a false view or the means of promoting fraternity and unity, that freedom of speech and of the press are discountenanced and protested against. With the Romanists it was the Unity of the Church, with Americans, it is the Unity of the States, or of Sects, or of the Voluntary Associations. Nothing must be said that might hazard unity! And, very strangely, the suppression of earnest thoughts and convictions, is urged upon us as a duty, in the name of "free thought and free speech!"

How long, or to what extent, "diversity of opinion" will continue, we pretend not, precisely, to say. But of one thing we are certain. The way to cure such diversity, is *not* to discountenance the free expression of diverse opinions.—Of their causes we have some significant intimations. "If any man will do my will, he shall know of my doctrine." When men become as disinterested, as impartial, as candid, and as pains taking, in their investigations of moral duties, as they are of the objects of the physical sciences, they will probably reach an equal degree of unanimity in respect to them. It would be an impeachment of the divine goodness and veracity, to say otherwise. "In the good time coming"—as compared with the present—"The light of the moon shall be as the sun, and the light of the sun, seven-fold, even the light of seven days." "If any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God." "and it shall be given him."—"Let us take care lest" in our mistaken zeal for "charitableness" and "fraternity" we not only "encroach upon the right of free thought and free speech among ourselves," but discredit the promises of God, who 'sanctifies his people through the truth,' and therefore promises to 'lead them into all truth,' and into the loving discharge of the duties which the truth reveals to them. The spirit of *love* inspires the prayer. "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" God always answers such prayer; and "fraternity" is one of its results. The spirit of *love* is the spirit of faithfulness. "Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart. Thou shalt, in any wise, rebuke thy neighbor, and not suffer sin upon him."—(Lev. 19—17.) The Evangelist again proceeds—

"(2.) The strength of our common foe should admonish us of the need of union, and of all the strength that the most perfect union can give. It will be long ere the friends of freedom, as opposed to slavery, have any strength to waste. Their foe is too deeply entrenched in the selfishness and depravity of the human heart to fall, save after a fearful death-struggle. It is no child's play to abolish American-Slavery."

Just change the word "Freedom" to "Temperance" and the word "Slavery" to "Intemperance," in the above paragraph, and you have a repetition of the old argument against Total Abstinence Societies, and against the facts and arguments showing that Temperance could not be promoted on any other principle, nor Intemperance overthrown by any other measure. The proper course would have been to have disproved

the facts or refuted the arguments of the teetotalers. But this appears to have been less convenient than to talk of "the common foe" and the "need of union."—Just so in the struggle against slavery. "The strength of the common foe, and the need of union" are apparent enough, as they were in the struggle against intemperance. But does it follow that a "union" of all the friends of Temperance, or of Freedom, upon a principle demonstrably false, and upon measures a thousand times proved, by experiment, to be visionary and impracticable, could have availed anything? Will the Evangelist say so, in respect to the Temperance movement? Will it show that the parallel does not now hold good, in the Anti Slavery movement?

"It is now child's play to abolish American Slavery."—Then let us cease tampering with it by childish expedients—by experiments which earnest children, in their sports even, were never yet known to employ—pledging themselves 'not to interfere' with the nuisance they had banded themselves together to remove! Were even children ever known to form a "union" on a basis like this?—"It will be long ere the friends of freedom will have any strength to waste," in such worse than "child's play."—"All the strength that the most perfect union can give"—is a vastly different thing from a mere aggregation of numbers or of votes. It must be based on an intelligent and earnest agreement in fundamental principles and corresponding measures.

"MINOR QUESTIONS."

But again—

"(3.) The defenders of slavery have never failed, for fifty years past, to be united on all main issues, however much they have differed on minor ones. For this reason, it seems a double pity and a double shame, that those who honestly oppose slavery, do not unite as warmly and as kindly, allowing like toleration, on questions of subordinate moment."

"Minor questions"—"minor points"—"minor issues." It is time to look this thrice repeated assumption in the face.—*Is it true* that Radical Abolitionists who vote their principles, differ from other Anti-Slavery or Non-Extension men, merely in respect to "minor questions"—"minor points"—"minor issues"? Is it a minor question whether the American people and the American Government are responsible for American Slavery, and under obligations to God and to human nature, to suppress it? Is it a minor question whether it be morally right to support a Presidential Candidate who obtained his nomination from a Convention to whom had been communicated his declaration,—*"I feel inflexible in the belief that it (slavery) ought not to be interfered with, where it exists, under the shield of State sovereignty?"* Is it a minor question whether it be morally right for a voter who believes in the Constitutional power and duty of the Federal Government to abolish slavery in the States, to vote for such a candidate?—We ask not, at this stage of the discussion, *how* these questions ought to be answered. We only ask whether these are "*minor questions*"—"questions of subordinate moment"?

Go, ask the four millions of slaves, held "under the shield of State sovereignty," whether it be a minor question? Inquire of disinterested common sense men, the world over, whether in disposing of the problem of American slavery, the

question of the action of the National Government (whose acts are the "supreme law of the land") respect to the nineteen and-a-half twentieths, or thirty nine fortieths of all the slavery in the land, be a "minor question"? Turn over the pages of the Old Testament Scriptures, "given by inspiration of God"—take notice what principles are there laid down and exemplified, concerning the responsibilities of nations, national Rulers and their supporters, for the existence and tolerance of oppression, injustice, and violence, and then say whether the question of the relation of the American people and their chosen rulers, to the enslavement of one sixth part of the people be a "minor question." Turn over the pages of universal history, wherein the same principles of Divine Government over the nations are exemplified, and then say whether it be a "minor question."—Examine the science of civil government, of legislation, of jurisprudence, of law. Consult the great masters of that science, from Moses and Justinian, down to Blackstone and Jefferson, and then say whether the question of national abolition of slavery in the States be a "minor question." Study the history, the institutions, the condition, and the exigencies of our own country, and say whether it be a "minor question."—If these be the "*minor questions*" what are the "*main issues*," and what have they been? Is it the Kansas question? Was it the Texas question? Was it the question of admitting new slave States? Did either or all of these constitute the "*main issue*" to which the continued enslavement of four millions was only a "question of subordinate moment"? By what rule of proportion is it thus determined? Would not a national abolition of slavery in the States, carry along with it all the others? And is it not the less included in the greater?

"The defenders of slavery have never failed for fifty years past, to be united on all main issues, however much they have differed on minor ones."—What were those "*main issues*" which they were united upon? Was it the Texas question? Why then did a majority of "anti-slavery" men "vote for Henry Clay to keep out Texas"? Was it the Mexican war, that Calhoun so eloquently deprecated? Was it the non-admission of free California, the continuance or non continuance of the Slave Trade in the Federal District, the "Compromise measures of 1850," in which Clay was pitted against so many of his Southern friends? Was it the system of slavery-extension, the Kansas Nebraska Bill, and the forcible subjugation of Kansas, in opposition to Blair, Benton, Houston and Bell? Is it the re-opening of the African Slave trade? Assuredly "the defenders of slavery" have never been united on any or all of these? And consequently *these* have *not* been regarded by them "the main issue."—What is it then?

"The defenders of slavery, for fifty years past," "however much they have differed on minor issues," "have never failed to unite on the main "*issue*"—namely—that slavery is entitled to the tolerance and consequent protection of the Federal Government, "in the States wherein it exists under [the shield of State Sovereignty]." They have never failed to be united in all those expositions of the Constitution, all those theories of State Rights, and all those bug-bear apprehensions of "centralization" and

"consolidation" by which the assumed right of slaveholding in the States has been kept in countenance. This has always been their "main issue," to which all minor ones have been subordinated, and made subservient. This has been the main trunk, of which all the others have been but sprouts and off-shoots. "For this reason, it seems a double pity and a double shame that all who honestly oppose slavery do not unite as warmly and as kindly" to grapple with "the common foe" on "the main issue." And it seems a three-fold pity and a three-fold shame, that the vast majority of them should so continuously and perseveringly concede "the main issue" on which "defenders of slavery have never failed to be united, for fifty years past."

VITAL IMPORTANCE OF RIGHT MEASURES.

"We make these remarks, [continues the Evangelist,] not unconscious of the difficulties which invest the great practical struggle against slavery. We do not and cannot forget that this struggle involves, in the outset, a plan of operation. This plan itself involves views and doctrines as to political rights, and the powers of our Government, both Federal and State—affording thus a considerably broad scope for difference of opinion on matters very important, if not even vital, to any effective anti-slavery effort."

The true course for the Evangelist, then, instead of complaining of the "uncharitableness" of Radical Abolitionists, should have been to institute a careful and thorough inquiry, whether their principles and measures were not indeed, (as they claim them to be) "vital" to the cause. Does the Evangelist take this course? Let us see.

"UNCHARITABLE AND UNFRATERNAL."

"Now, it is not our present object, by any means, to enter at large upon the discussion of these questions. We allude to the subject, at this time, for this special purpose of entering our protest against what seems to us a very uncharitable and unfraternal charge brought against those who acted recently with the Republican party, by some of those who take the name of Radical Abolitionists." It appears in the January number of the 'Radical Abolitionist.' It reaches us personally now and then, in a private letter. The charge denies that we are really anti-slavery. It implies that we are responsible for the continued wrongs of the slave, and implies this on the assumption that we do nothing, and do not aim to do any thing for his freedom. To maintain this charge, it is deemed enough to say—You only attack slavery in the line of withstanding its extension to other territory; we hold that Congress can and ought to abolish it in the States where it exists. We are really Anti-Slavery men; but you are unworthy of the name, because you go not with us in our doctrine and effort as to its abolition by Congress."

"Thus, the doctrine that Congress has power to abolish slavery in the States, is made the test of Anti-Slavery orthodoxy."

"Against this, we enter our protest."

The question whether Radical Abolitionists are needlessly rigid and exclusive, must necessarily depend, very much, upon a correct decision of the questions, upon the discussion of which the Evangelist 'does not propose to enter at large.'

The allusion to our paper, we are not able distinctly to understand. In our October and November numbers, we commented largely upon the course of those who professed to hold our views of the Constitution and of national responsibilities, and yet voted as we believed, in opposition to those views. The Evangelist makes no mention of these comments and they could not apply to its case. It was in the January number that our "uncharitableness" appeared, but the Editor failed to designate the

article, or to quote from it. We have looked over our Editorials, in that number, without being able to discover what could have been offensive. If it was the letter of Samuel McFarland and our commendation of it, we should like to see a full, lucid, and argumentative refutation of it. A mere complaint about "uncharitableness" cannot answer instead of such refutation.

The letter, written for the same object with our letters of October and November, was accordingly addressed to one who had admitted the Constitutional right and duty of a Federal abolition of slavery in the States, and went to show the inconsistency of his voting on the Republican platform and for Col. Fremont.—The Evangelist complains that some body "denies that we"—("who acted, recently, with the Republican party") "are really anti-slavery." The Address of the Radical Abolitionists distinctly conceded that Republicans were "anti-slavery" to a certain extent, and precisely as set forth by them in their platform. Mr. McFarland, as we understand him, does not deny this. But he does show, what the Republican leaders have, from the beginning, been most anxious to maintain, that Republicans are not Abolitionists. From which Mr. McFarland infers that Abolitionists could not consistently vote with them, and he maintains that it is wrong to vote for a candidate pledged not to interfere with slavery in the States. Even "Anti-Slavery men" may possibly do wrong, (as the Evangelist thinks we have done,) and if they do, the wrong should be pointed out to them, as the Evangelist is accustomed to do. And there is nothing "uncharitable" nor "unfraternal" in doing so.

From the beginning, large numbers have claimed to be "Anti-Slavery men" though not "Abolitionists." The Evangelist, as we understand it, prefers to take rank with the former, yet desires fraternity also with the latter.—It addresses "ANTI-SLAVERY MEN," and commences with—"All Anti-slavery men should be brethren," intending, we suppose, to include abolitionists, but without, itself, taking their name. In reference to itself, and those whom it defends, it repeatedly uses the term "Anti-Slavery," or "friends of freedom," but not the term "abolitionist," which it reserves for the "Radicals." In this it resembles Republican Editors in general, and Republican members of Congress. If "some of those who take the name of Radical Abolitionists" should have questioned the Abolitionism of the Evangelist and those "who acted recently with the Republican party," we see no reason why any of them should think it "uncharitable." Abolitionists should not force upon "Anti-Slavery men" a name which they avoid taking, themselves. For our own part, we are willing that all should be called "Abolitionists" who call themselves so. But if some "Anti-Slavery men" would not choose the reproach of that name, they must not lay claim to any of the honors it may confer, nor complain that there exists a fraternity to which they do not choose to belong.

If asked to define the difference between an "anti-slavery man" and an "abolitionist," we confess to some doubts on the subject. We have never perceived that the position of "anti-slavery men"—as distinguished from abolition-

ists, has ever been clearly defined by them. We remember how a southern Editor once called the Editor of the Journal of Commerce, a hypocrite, because he said he was an "anti-slavery man" and "not an abolitionist," but we will not follow such an authority, nor put our good brother of the Evangelist in such bad company. He would not be, at all, at home, there. We venture to suggest then, that an "anti-slavery man" is one who is opposed to slavery; and that an "abolitionist" is one who proposes to have civil government abolish it. This, in its wide scope, would include those who wished to have the State Governments abolish slavery. But, in *National Politics*, it could only include those who proposed to have the National Government abolish the slavery that exists in the Nation. And this would imply the belief that the National Government had rightful authority to abolish it.—In distinction from either of the preceding, we would suggest that "Emancipationist" would be the proper name of one who should labor to persuade the slaveholder to emancipate his slaves, without invoking any action of civil Government at all. Such are our own conceptions of the terms. But if any man seem to be contentious, or aggrieved, or deem us "uncharitable" or "unfraternal," we will cast all our definitions to the winds. Men have the responsibility of calling themselves by whatever names they please, of and honoring their names and professions as they judge proper, yet mutually subject to the inspection and opinions of their fellows. We quote again, from the Evangelist.

POWERS OF CONGRESS—ADMISSIONS.

"It is a sufficient ground for this protest that men may have other and very adequate reasons for rejecting this doctrine, besides the absence of Anti-Slavery principle and spirit."

"In defence of this position, we have a few things to say, specially bearing on the powers of Congress."

"We premise, however, that we speak of these powers only as existing under ordinary, and not extraordinary circumstances. J. Q. Adams boldly said on the floor of the House, that, in case of a formidable foreign invasion, Congress would have power to set every slave free—under that clause of the Constitution which empowers them to provide for the common defence of the country. A state of war may make that lawful and proper which would not be in time of peace. We concur most fully in this opinion. Our remarks except those circumstances."

The clause of the Constitution quoted by Mr. Adams, and the great principle upon which that clause was founded, are just as applicable to "the common defence" against internal enemies as to the same defence against foreign enemies. Slavery is a state of war. Wherever there is slavery there is an enemy. We have Mr. Jefferson's authority for this. And an internal enemy is vastly more dangerous than an external one. The war already exists. When the final battle is to come on, is a profound secret. The principle, and the clause of the Constitution would be as appropriately applied to the abolition of slavery, to day, as it would be, if the country were to be invaded by a foreign army, to-morrow. The utterance of the sentiment by J. Q. Adams, was intended to alarm the slaveholders, and it did alarm them. They saw in it the doom of slavery, whenever the principle should be applied.

THEORY OF "LIMITATIONS."

The Evangelist next says:

"The subject being thus qualified, we remark, 1. Congress, created under the Federal Constitution exists and acts with only limited and expressed powers. Beyond these, it has no more power to abolish slavery than the American Anti-Slavery Society has."

What is here said of the powers of Congress

under the Federal Constitution, is no more true of them, than if said of the Legislature and the Constitution of any State in the Union—New York or Ohio, for example. The Democratic doctrine that the *'just powers of Government are derived from the consent of the governed,'* is no more true of the National Government than of the State Governments. The meaning of the maxim (unless we abjure the "Higher Law") cannot be that the Government can have no just powers to secure the inalienable rights of its subjects, unless the Constitution expressly says so, and unless, moreover, it specifies chattel slavery, as among the violations of human rights which the Government is to restrain. The absurdity of this is apparent. It would need a Constitution as voluminous as an Encyclopedia to specify *all* the forms of violating human rights to which human beings are daily liable. And if a single one of them should be omitted in the Constitution, then the Legislature would "have no more power to abolish" the usage, than the American Anti-Slavery Society! Alas, for us, if our Legislation and jurisprudence are to be restricted by maxims like these! No form of crime can be suppressed by law, unless the Constitution has expressly provided that the Legislature may prohibit that particular crime!

See how the maxim stands, in the Declaration of Independence, whence it was originally derived.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments [all legitimate governments] are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed," &c.

What is meant by the latter clause of the paragraph? And what is meant by "just powers"? Is it meant that the question whether or no the government that was instituted to secure the inalienable rights of all men, this being its sole end and object—shall have the power and authority to do so, is a question that must first be gravely deliberated and voted upon by the people, in forming their Constitution, wherein must be specified *every form* of aggression upon those rights, which the Government may have "just powers" to prohibit? Assuredly this cannot be the meaning.—What is it then?—Simply this.

All men have inalienable rights, including, primarily, the right to liberty. Governments are instituted to protect these rights. This is the business of all Governments.—But the questions arise (especially when a new nation is coming into existence)—"Who are the Government?—Of whom is it composed? By what authority is it organized? From whom are its just powers derived?—From hereditary kings and nobles, or from the people? The answer is—The people, or their representatives, are to constitute the Government. From the people—from the governed, (of course there can be no slaves) the authority is derived. The people, whose inalienable rights are to be protected, organize and authorize the Government to protect them—to do the work for which, "Governments are instituted among men."

Does this look like instituting a Government to protect or *not* to protect inalienable rights according as the particular modes of violating them, may or may not have been specified on the parchment? No, indeed. The very reverse of

this. It is to be taken for granted that "the governed" instituted the Government for the protection of all their inalienable rights. And this is precisely what the Declaration of Independence affirms. By the expositions of slaveholders, the maxim of our fathers has been reversed. And even "anti-slavery men" repeat and endorse the perversion!

RESULTS OF THIS PERVERSION.

Look next, at the results of this perversion, if extended, as it might just as properly be, to the State Governments.—The Constitution of the State of New York, among its enumerated and expressed powers of the Legislature, makes no mention of any powers to abolish slavery. Therefore the Legislature of New York had "no more power to abolish slavery than the American Anti-Slavery Society." This is precisely the position taken by a distinguished member of Congress, a few weeks ago.* The pending suit, of Virginia vs. New York, respecting the slaves of Mr. Lemmon, liberated by Judge Paine, rests on the same basis.—Christian Editors—"Anti-Slavery" Editors, in a day like this, ought to know and to proclaim, in the ears of all the people, that "Power belongeth unto God,"—that Civil Government is from Him—that there can be no civil Government with powers so "limited" as *not* to include the power of "executing justice between a man and his neighbor,"—or "delivering him that is spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor."

OF THE CONSTITUTION.

But of the Constitution, still further. We are told that there is a broad distinction between the State and the National Governments, in their power to protect their citizens from chattelhood, because the States are the original sovereignties, from which our nationality and national Government were afterwards derived, when the Federal Constitution was formed. But this statement has no foundation in truth. There were no State sovereignties, until they were created by the Declaration of Independence, which was a national act, proclaiming a national existence. And along with that national existence, all essential national responsibilities were included, even that of securing the inalienable rights of the people, as the Declaration itself affirms.

Resort has been had to Article 10 of the amendments—"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it, to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." From this it has been inferred, that since the right to abolish slavery (as it is affirmed) is not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, therefore it remains exclusively with the States, or the people.

But this argument implies, what is not true, namely, that it is possible to delegate *any* civil powers to *any* government, without including, of necessity, and by inevitable implication, the power of protecting the personality of its citizens—their security from chattelhood. There can be no Government without allegiance, and no allegiance without protection. There can be no Government without citizens, and a Government without power to prevent its citizens from being chattelized, and thereby deprived of citizenship, would be without any power to remain a Government at all.

The conclusion attempted to be derived from Article 10 is upset by Article 9. "The enumeration, in the Constitution, of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."—So that if the Constitution had failed to specify the right of exemption from chattelhood, that original and inalienable right remained reserved, and was to be protected by the Government, equally with the minor rights that flow from it, and which were specified. Not one of them could be secured, if the right to personal liberty could not be secured, which lies at the basis of them all. So that a denial of the power of the Federal Government to protect all the people from chattelhood, amounts virtually to a denial of its power to secure any of their rights or interests, or to be of any benefit to them at all.

POWERS "CONFERRED."

But the direct answer to the plea under consideration is, that among "the powers delegated to the United States by the Constitution," the powers to "establish justice and secure the blessings of liberty" to "the people of the United States"—"and their posterity" stand foremost in the instrument, forming the basis of all its powers, and that this power is quite as explicit, and as comprehensive as if the word "security from slavery" had been employed. Still further, a number of its specific provisions are direct to the point, as will appear soon. We quote the Evangelist, further:

"On all hands it must be conceded that the power to abolish slavery in the sovereign States, is not given to Congress by the Constitution, in express terms. The question whether it is implied in those general statements which speak of human rights, may be settled, it would seem, by the history of those times when it was framed and adopted—on the principle that the instrument actually means what it was understood to mean by those who framed and by those who first adopted it. No doubt here was a strong anti-slavery feeling in the country at that time; but we have not seen the first item of evidence to show that the States then relinquished to Congress the right to legislate on the question of slavery within their pale of jurisdiction."

It is *not* 'conceded, on all hands' that the power in question 'is not given to Congress in express terms.'—Patrick Henry, in the Virginia Convention that adopted the Constitution, affirmed, directly the contrary, and no man appears to have disputed him.—Said Patrick Henry—

"Congress, by the Constitution, has power to declare all slaves free." "There is no ambiguous implication, or logical deduction. The paper speaks to the point. They have the power, in clear and unequivocal terms, and they will clearly and certainly exercise it."

Gov. Randolph responded—

"I hope there is no one here who will advance an objection so dishonorable to Virginia. I hope that, at the moment they are securing the rights of their citizens, an objection will not be started, that those unfortunate men now held in bondage, by the operation of the General Government, may be made free."

With this "understanding" the Constitution was ratified by Virginia. But the Editor of the Oberlin Evangelist "has not seen the first item of evidence to show that the States then relinquished to Congress the right to legislate on the question of slavery within their jurisdiction"—which only proves that the Editor is not as well posted up, on the subject, as an "Anti-Slavery" Editor ought to be. Gerrit Smith, in his speech in Congress, on the Nebraska Bill, adduced the facts above stated, and, in this and other ways, so conclusively proved the power of

* Hon. Mr. Branch of North Carolina.

Congress over slavery in the States that no one adventured to answer him. Gen. Granger, in a short but pithy speech, has since taken the same ground, and all the champions of slavery who heard him, were again prudently silent, and the New York Tribune virtually declared it unanswerable. A copy of Spooner's Unconstitutionality of slavery was sent to every member of Congress, more than a year ago, and although it has frequently been alluded to, in debate, by the Democrats, and its sentiments disclaimed by the Republicans, yet no one has attempted to point out its fallacies or show how to get rid of its conclusions. The Garrisonian Anti-Slavery Society, which advocates disunion on the plea that the Constitution tolerates slavery, has been challenged to a public discussion of the Constitution on this point, and has declined. And now, after the pro-slavery and the Garrisonian disputants have abandoned the field, the Evangelist, which is neither pro-slavery nor Garrisonian, picks up and brings forward to shoot over again, their blunted arrows, in defence of those "anti-slavery men" who "recently acted with the Republican party." If this be their strongest defence, they had better capitulate.

To be continued.

WENDELL PHILLIPS ON DISUNION.

At the Disunion Convention at Worcester, January 15th, as reported in the Liberator on January 30th, Wendell Phillips made a long and eloquent speech in favor of disunion. We have read it carefully to find an answer to the very natural inquiries—"Why must the Union be dissolved?" and "How and in what manner is it supposed that a dissolution of the Union would produce the abolition of slavery?" The results of our examination will appear in the following extracts. Says Mr. Phillips:

"I am not going into the question of the technicalities of the Constitution, I do not care now about them. For the purposes of this hour, we may take it for granted that the Constitution, as at present interpreted and executed, is a pro-slavery Constitution—used by Slavery for its own purposes; that the power of dictating the course to be pursued under that Constitution is in the hands of the Slave Power. You know what that Slave Power is. I do not mean by that phrase an exclusively Southern power. The Slave Power is here in Worcester just as much as in Charleston, S. C. The Slave Power is three-fold: it has the power of wealth—two thousand millions of dollars invested in slaves, drawing to it the sympathy of all other kinds of capital. That is the first power, and in the nineteenth century, the money sway is omnipotent. Then it has, secondly, the aristocracy of the Constitution; and, thirdly, the prejudice against color."

And so, the question of disunion lies outside of the construction of the Constitution. Whatever the instrument itself may be, it is, at present, in the hands of the slaveholders, and therefore there must be a dissolution of the Union. Now, it strikes us that if the Constitution be itself anti-slavery, the best, the easiest, and most direct way of abolishing slavery, would be to get it out of the hands of the slaveholders, and use it in favor of freedom. By Mr. Phillips' own showing, a dissolution of the Union would *not* be a separation from the Slave Power. It would *not* be a consummation of the motto "No Union with slaveholders," for "the Slave Power is here in Worcester, just as much as in Charleston, S. C." The aristocracy of wealth in Massachusetts, would still be in

sympathy with the aristocracy of slaveholders—for Mr. Phillips himself, in defining his "disunion," says—

"I mean to take Massachusetts, and leave her exactly as she is, commercially. She shall manufacture for the South just as Lancashire does." . . . "What I would do with Massachusetts is this—I would make her, in relation to South Carolina, what England is."

And what good would *that* do? Commercial sympathy (and, for aught we know, ecclesiastical sympathy) would remain as at present, and the masses of the common people, who are now in a position to exert a political influence against slavery, would then have no vote on the subject, either in favor of abolition or of non-extension. "The prejudice against color" would likewise remain. Two of the three elements of the Slave Power would remain, and remain at the North.—And what of the third element—"the aristocracy of the Constitution?" By this phrase Mr. P. designates, as we understand him, the political advantage gained by the slaveholders, in the apportionment clause, giving them a vote on three-fifths of the slaves. By a dissolution of the Union, *the North* would get rid of *that*. But would the *slave* reap the benefit of it? As it now is, the free States, notwithstanding the inequality of representation, are able to control the national politics, and, *if disposed to do so*, could liberate the slaves. In case of dissolution, the free States would have *no* political power whatever on the slavery question—nor will they have gained any additional moral power. By the showing of Mr. Phillips himself, it will not have been a moral, nor a commercial, but only a political disunion.

As to the practical workings of disunion, considered as a means of abolishing slavery, all the light we can gather from the long and able speech of Wendell Phillips, is contained in the following—

"Dissolution of the Union gets rid of slavery, because it is an artificial institution, backed up by artificial laws, which, when you let down the waters to a common level, must go to pieces by the action of gravity. The dissolution of the Union is removing the dam. To-day the white man stands with his heel on the head of the slave. You and I stand behind him—you, voters, directly, and all of us, by the impossibility of making our protest fully known. When dissolution takes place, I do not say the slave will cut his master's throat, or burn his mansion-house. All I say is, that he will probably try to do it, unless the master plants in his heart a motive not to do so; and until he does, 'God speed the first insurrection in the Carolinas!' I have no love for insurrections; but 'Hands off' is a good Saxon motto. Let the two races fight it out; and if the white man has no means of defence, by making the black man love him, then he will suffer for the misgovernment of two centuries. That is his own lookout. Gen. Wilson says, he 'believes that the liberal, high-minded, just (!) men of the South will, in their own time and in their own way, bring about a safe emancipation.' I never knew of a race of oppressors that was preached into doing justice; they have always been bulled into it. If any man thinks otherwise, let him show me a single instance where a powerful, despotic class ever voluntarily surrendered power out of its own hands. I believe in the slaveholder being brought to give bonds for good behavior, by the circumstances in which he is to be placed, by the necessities of his position. Talk of chivalry! The whole South is one great magazine of cowards! Ten slaves in the upper corner of Tennessee are *suspected*, (for they did not keep the poor fellows alive long enough to prove it,) of an intention to rebel, and the easternmost corner of chivalrous Virginia trembles! too mad with fear to wait for the second news from Tennessee, that there was no plot or purpose to rise. Our old Professor of Natural Philosophy, John Farrar, used to say to us, with great solemnity, 'If I touch that spot, the universe trembles.' It was true; and when a slave makes an impudent answer on the banks of the Mississippi, South Carolina trembles. That is the chivalry of the South! That present fear is kept down by the consciousness that sixteen States, with their powerful free blood and organized strength, stand round the system. Take it off! That fear is God's own stimulus to virtue—let it have full play! When they set horses to run in the Roman races, each horse bears around him a little net-work of pointed pricks, that the faster he goes, makes him run yet faster. I would set the slaveholder to running with four millions of slaves for the pricks. (Applause.) Dissolution is my method for that race. Dissolution, in other words, is only the philosophy of letting natural causes have free play. I would take down the dam of the Union, and let loose the torrent of God's own water-courses; and, like every current, you may be sure it will clear a channel for itself. (Loud Applause.)"

And so the "dissolution of the Union" doctrine has dwindled down, at last, to this—an expedient for settling the slavery question by a masterly inactivity at the North—"Hands off! Let the two races fight it out!"—It is no longer a matter of conscientious scruples about supporting our wicked "pro-slavery Constitution." That plea is now waived. Of the "technicalities of the Constitution"—its words—its provisions—Mr. Phillips is studiously and wisely oblivious. He "does not, now, care about them." They may be pro-slavery, or they may be anti-slavery. The Union, in either case, must be dissolved.

But why? Is it because it is wicked for the people of the North to remain connected with "pro-slavery?" No. For when Massachusetts is dis severed from South Carolina, it will have pro-slavery in the very heart of the Commonwealth still. Is it because a dissolution would "increase the moral power" of the North? And because abolition must be exclusively the work of "moral suasion," without any admixture of that naughty element of "physical force" which is wrapped up in "political action," because "the ballot box is supported by the cartridge box?" So we were taught by the Liberator and its supporters, a few years ago. And the echo of it is occasionally repeated still. But the present plea of Mr. Phillips ignores "moral suasion" altogether, and appeals solely to physical force! He demands to be shown a single instance in which moral suasion ever prevailed with a powerful despotic class. "The fear" of physical force "is God's own stimulus to virtue—let it have full play." "God speed the first insurrection in the Carolinas." "I would set the slaveholder to running with four millions of slaves for the pricks. Dissolution is my method for that race."

Strange language this, for "Non-Resistants" to use, who were wont to insist that all physical compulsion was wrong. Political action, it seems, is to be abjured—*not* because it implies "physical force" and looks in the direction of civil war—(Mr. Garrison's old objection to voting)—but because "dissolution" is a better method of bringing physical force into "*free play*."

For ourselves, we must still prefer the use of the ballot box. Properly used, it would super-

cede the use of the cartridge box. And whatever the final result may be, we protest against the doctrine and policy of "*Hands off! Let the two races fight it out,*" at the South. We protest against such language from abolitionists, like Wendell Phillips, who know and loudly proclaim that American slavery is a National Sin for the responsibility and guilt of which the North comes in for a large share. We call on Wendell Phillips, in the use of his eloquent voice, to join with us in demanding—not that Massachusetts and the free North, shall stand "*HANDS OFF*" in a struggle like this—but that Massachusetts and the free North, in the quiet exercise of their Constitutional powers, shall "*proclaim liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof.*" The hazards of a National proclamation like this, as against the petty oligarchy of slaveholders, already trembling at the suspected insurrection of ten slaves in the upper corner of Tennessee, ought not to deter him from so plain a moral and political duty. The prospects of a bloody termination of slavery which Mr. Phillips now seems to anticipate, would almost wholly disappear—for who would resist the righteous decree?

We have said that the speech of Mr. Phillips is a long and an eloquent one. It is occupied mainly with a graphic description of the doings of the Slave Power, by means of our National Government—the *blame* of which he casts upon "*the Union*" instead of placing it where it belongs—upon the neglect of the people of the free States to *make use* of the Constitution and "*the Union*" for their high purposes of "establishing justice, and securing the blessings of liberty for themselves and their posterity!" Not all the eloquence of Mr. Phillips could redeem his speech from the unphilosophical error of confounding the Constitution and the Union with the violation and perversion of them.

"POSITION DEFINED—NO APOLOGIES."

Under this head, the National Era of January 29, defends the Republican members of Congress from the charge of making apologies to the slaveholders, in their speeches on the President's Message—They were only defining their position, and defending themselves against false accusations. If they had held the views of Disunionists or of Radical Abolitionists, they would have said so, but as they did not, it was their privilege and duty to make themselves understood and to silence misrepresentations.

Very good. We are not conscious of having said aught against this. The Era, however, seems impressed with the idea that somebody has done so.—It says:

"Alas for the Republicans! Radical Abolitionists and Disunion Abolitionists may severally define their position, and disclaim concurrence with Republicans, but if Republicans exercise the same right, O, they are crying, they are apologising to slaveholders!"

If we have, in any way, given occasion for the above paragraph, we think it must have been by copying from the Boston Chronicle (a *Republican* paper) an article headed—"What the *Republican party means to do.*"—We are aware late that "the Republican" speeches in Congress have been very annoying to many in the Republican ranks, as well as to abolitionists who voted with them. They could never before be made to believe or admit that the position of the Republican party was what those speeches now repre-

sent it to be. We tell them it was mainly their own fault that they did not so understand it. We have said distinctly that the Republicans in Congress, and all the National leaders of the party were clear of the charges made by the Democrats against them—that Mr. Wilson, in particular, "was perfectly right in saying that the Republican party was not an abolition party," though we did say that he "had no right to deny that a large body of Radical Abolitionists voted with them." And we marvelled that John P. Hale should have said that "he had never met with an individual who advocated the doctrine that Congress had power to abolish slavery in the Southern States." We also attested the truth of the charge that subordinate or local leaders did, very extensively, make representations which led abolitionists to believe that they were substantially with them. And still further, we showed how a misprint of the Republican platform led thousands into the same error.—Our object, in what we have written on the subject of the recent "*Discussions in Congress,*" has been—

1. To place the record of facts concerning the relation between Republicans and Abolitionists, precisely where it ought to be, and thus,

2. To show abolitionists (what many of them have been strangely slow to understand,) that Republicans have no intentions of favoring abolition, and consequently, that abolitionists "threw away their votes" in voting with them.

3. We wished to show how completely the "*Concessions and disclaimers*" of Republicans—(we do not find that we have called them "*apologies*") have thrown them into the hands of their opponents, who evidently make it their study to draw out such concessions and disclaimers, and seem evidently to feel safe, so long as they can thus prevent them from occupying a more advanced and impregnable position.

4. We wished to apprise the public in general of the true secret of the late Southern panic, and that it arose solely from the mistake that Republicans are Abolitionists in disguise. It ought to be understood that the chief fear of the slaveholders is—and has been—that there will arise a party that will wield the American Government against American slavery. If the friends of freedom fully understood this, they would be led to suspect that the vigorous support of such a party would be the most efficient mode of warfare against the Oligarchy and against slavery extension.

These objects we deemed legitimate and proper; and in the pursuit of them we had no design to find fault with Republicans for defining their position, nor for exercising that undoubted right in such a manner as to show that they have no affinity with abolitionists nor desire to promote the objects cherished by them. We do indeed regret that such is the fact, but since it is so, we have no desire that the fact should be concealed. So far from blaming the Republican members of Congress for not concealing them, or for defining their position, we have done what we could to give publicity to their definitions and disclaimers, in the hope that, so long as the fact remains as it is, and has been, there may be, in future, no misunderstanding in respect to it. We have been much blamed for

representing the position of the Republican party to be what the recent Republican speeches in Congress declare it to be. To us, therefore, the definition was most opportune. We are receiving many letters admitting that, in the light of those speeches, our representations of the Republican party are now found to be correct, and our objections against it to be well founded.

Radical Abolitionist.

NEW YORK, MARCH, 1857.

Letters for the Editor of the Radical Abolitionist, or the Treasurer of the American Abolition Society, should be addressed to Post office box No. 1212, No. 48 Beekman st. New York. We shall then get them without the delay and extra charge of two cents for delivery by the penny post.

TAKE NOTICE, that we do not make any charges for papers sent to those who have not ordered or subscribed for them.

THE PROPOSED NATIONAL CONVENTION.

We continue the publication of the Circular, inviting signatures to the Call for a National Convention, and extending the time of returning those signatures to us, until THE TENTH OF APRIL NEXT. Let those who favor the measure LOSE NO TIME in obtaining signatures and returning the names. The sooner it is done, the better.

And remember that the names wanted are of those who *pledge themselves to attend* the Convention at Rochester, June 10th and 11th. Names of persons merely *approving* and *recommending* such a Convention, are not what is needed. Five hundred thousand of such names would not make a Convention. Expressions of *opinion*, and friendly good wishes, are all very well in their place. But when definite, determined ACTION is called for, it is necessary to know WHO WILL ACT? Armies are raised by actual, matter-of-fact *enlistment*, not by putting down the names of those who are *in favor* of having an army, and would *wish well* to one.

"WHO WILL ATTEND THE CONVENTION?" That is the question. Those who *desire* a Convention must help *make* a Convention.

And the number of names sent by the 10th of April will determine *whether* the Convention at the place and time proposed shall be held at all.

RADICALISM IN PENNSYLVANIA.

The Radical Abolitionists of Warren county, Pa., held a Convention at Sugar Grove, Jan. 13th—D. Titus, Chairman, A. R. Titus, Secretary. Prayer by Rev. W. R. King. The object of the meeting having been stated by L. H. Pratt, a Committee consisting of James Catlin, W. R. King, and James Gates, was appointed to prepare a Preamble and Resolutions—which were reported and unanimously adopted as follows—

"Whereas, the leading organ of the Republican party has discovered that "Policy must be mortal, but that truth is as eternal as God himself," that "whether the election of candidates be secured or not, makes no difference with duty, that responsibilities are for men, results with God" therefore

Resolved, That we congratulate the Abolitionists of the country that their principles find such expression and endorsement given after election, and that

we shall no more be taunted with throwing away our votes because we vote to sustain principles in accordance with our conscientious convictions.

Resolved, That we repeat, that the only standard of moral obligation is the Divine Will. That the Divine Will is, that Slavery be immediately and unconditionally abolished. Hence we cannot follow the "Times" or "Issues" or "Crises" or "circumstances" or even "consequences," instead of what should be our rule of duty.

Resolved, That whatever doubt may have existed in the excitement of the campaign as to the real and ultimate design and position of the Republican party, there can be none now, since the leaders and standard bearers have testified upon their examination before the nation that they never intended to abolish slavery in the country.

Resolved, Therefore, that it is not true that the limitation of slavery, not the abolition of slavery is the issue now before the people—so far from this, the only issue, and that presented by Jehovah himself, is, and has been since the first slave was brought to this country, 'break every yoke, let the oppressed go free.'

Resolved, That we cordially approve of the proposition made by our friends abroad, to call a National Convention at Rochester, New York in June next. That we pledge ourselves to be represented there by at least two delegates.

Resolved, That we now proceed to organize a county Abolition Association, auxiliary to the American Abolition Society, and that we recommend the abolitionists of the several townships to form societies auxiliary to the county society.

Resolved, That for the purpose of perfecting an organization, we adopt the constitution of the American Abolition Society.

Resolved, That we rely upon abolitionists to make good their declaration made before the late election, and now, that the 'this once' is past, return again and for the last time to the foundation principles of radical abolitionism."

A County Society was organized, and the meeting adjourned to assemble at Lottsville, Jan. 26th.

This looks like doing something.

THEODORE PARKER, ON DISSOLUTION AND THE CONSTITUTION.

Extract of a Letter from Theodore Parker to the Worcester Dissolution Convention.

"I am glad to see any sign of manhood in the North, and I think a little fire in the rear of some of our Republican members of Congress will do them no harm. But I do not myself desire a dissolution of the Union just now. Here is the reason—The North is seventeen millions strong, and the South contains eleven millions, whereof four millions are slaves, and four millions are 'poor whites.' Now, I don't think it quite right for the powerful North to back out of the Union, and leave the four millions 'poor whites,' and the four millions slaves to their present condition with the ghastly consequences which are sure to follow. Men talk a great deal about the compromises of the Constitution, but forget the guarantees of the Constitution. The very article which contains the ambiguous 'rendition clause,' has also these plain words: 'The United States shall guarantee a republican form of government to every State in the Union.' Article 4, section 4. [I quote from memory. You can look at the passage.] Now, I would perform that obligation before I would dissolve the Union. I don't think it would be quite fair for strong minded Moses to stay in Median keeping his sheep and junketing with his neighbors. No. 'So the Lord said unto him, down into Egypt with you; meet Pharaoh face to face, and bring up all Israel into the land I shall give you. It is not enough to save your own souls alive, but your brethren also, with their wives and little ones.' Why, even that henpecked husband in the story had too much stuff to

desert his sons and daughters, and run away from their ugly dam. No, Sir; the North must do well by those four millions of slaves, and those four millions of 'poor whites.' We must bring the mixed multitude even out of the inner house of bondage, peaceably if we can, forcibly if we must."

Again, at the Annual Meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, (as reported in the Liberator of Feb. 13,) Theodore Parker said—

"The United States guarantees to every State, a Republican form of government; and what that is, may be learned from the programme of American principles, in the preamble to the Constitution of the United States.

"A Republic must guarantee life, liberty, and the pursuit of just means of happiness, to every individual within its boundary. But South Carolina has 383,000 slaves, owned by 40,000 freemen. Is that Republicanism? Wilson said the Republican party do not go against slavery, in the slave States;—they are the worst words that Wilson ever spoke—for that I deliver him over to your criticism."

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A FEMALE SLAVE. Redfield. 34 Beekman st. New York.

One indication of increasing attention to the subject of slavery is found in the fact that the literature of the country, within the past few years, has partaken, so extensively, of an anti-slavery character. The age makes the author, and the under-current of anti-slavery sentiment that has long been at work in portions of the community, has, at length, exerted a marked influence over the public press. From the daily newspaper to the most ably conducted literary periodical—among the latest publications of whatever form—in fact or fiction—*slavery* is the all-important subject. A large portion of the novels—indeed nearly all that have excited any attention—within a few years past, have been of a decided anti-slavery tendency. Among these latter we have been much interested in the perusal of an "Autobiography of a Female Slave." This volume exhibits slavery in its true character. A melancholy example of the absolute ownership of the slave, by his master, is given in the case of Henry, who having, by the most persevering industry, succeeded in obtaining funds sufficient to purchase his freedom, was coolly informed by his master that both himself and his money were legally his, and that he had sold him to a trader. The heroine of the story, a beautiful, young slave girl, nearly white, and well educated, became at an early age, the property of a vulgar, brutal, though wealthy family, with whom she remained during a large portion of her life in slavery. On being sold, she passed into the hands of a noble-minded, amiable lady, by whom she was emancipated; though not before the death of her lover, Henry—who, goaded to madness by the flagrant injustice of his master, committed suicide on the day in which they were both to have become free.

The tale is one of the most absorbing interest throughout; and the author, a Kentucky lady, and consequently, well qualified to write such a work—seems deeply imbued with the spirit of benevolence. The work will be extensively read.

For sale at our Depository, 48 Beekman st. Price one dollar, postage pre-paid.

PRINCIPLES—THEIR EXISTENCE AND EXTENSION.

"A principle that does not extend itself, is doomed to wither like a sapless tree." "Principles, good or bad, can subsist only by extension."—Kossuth.

When we published the above from Kossuth, in our last paper, we failed to add a comment or two, as we had intended.

While it is true, that "a principle that does not extend itself, is doomed to wither," it is also true, that a principle permitted to *exist*, will extend itself. A *good* principle will do this from its own vitality, and a *bad* principle from the temptations and tendencies to evil.

Though "principles, good or bad, can subsist only by extension," it is not therefore to be inferred, that bad principles will die, if let alone; nor that their extension can be prevented by merely hemming them in, and "localizing" them. For, if the good principles that are employed against them, do nothing more, than to make such attempts, then *they* fail of "extending" themselves, and "wither like a sapless tree."

Existence and extension belong together. But as existence comes before extension, so a blow aimed at the *existence* of a principle, is more effective than one aimed at its *extension*.

For the Radical Abolitionist.

"YOUR MIGHTY SINS."

Amos v. 12th—"For I know your manifold transgressions, and your mighty sins; they afflict the just, they take a bribe, and they turn aside the poor in the gate, from their right."

QUESTION:—

Do ecclesiastical judicatories, and Bible, Tract, and Missionary Societies "turn aside" from their appropriate work, if they rebuke those who are guilty of such "mighty sins?"

J. R. J.

Newfield, N. Y., December 31st, 1856.

To subscribers in Windham county, Conn.

Dear Friends—Last spring I obtained about two hundred names in your county for this paper. We hope that you will continue to be subscribers. Do please thoroughly examine the principles which are taught in the "Radical."

As to slavery, the "let alone" policy will not do. Dissolution of the Union is not manly. The experiments of mere non-extension have had *their* day. What next, for "practical business men?"

Yours, J. R. JOHNSON.

Newfield, N. Y., January 17th, 1857.

FUNDS STILL WANTED!

Our friends, who wish to promote the cause of Radical Abolition, are assured that their assistance was never more needed, and that there never has been a time when funds could be employed more advantageously, or with better prospects of producing immediate and beneficial effects, than at the present moment. We could employ several good lecturing agents, if we had the means, and we could greatly extend the circulation of our publications where they would be read with avidity.

Within a short time we have expended considerable sums in publishing valuable works which we have furnished gratuitously to members of Congress and State Legislatures, and we rely on our friends to replenish our Treasury.

NATIONAL CONVENTION.

TO RADICAL ABOLITIONISTS.

E Each one of you to whom this paper shall come, or to whom it may be shown, will please to consider the following CIRCULAR, as a letter addressed to yourself, personally, *by name*, and will please to answer it accordingly.

CIRCULAR.

NEW YORK, Jan. 1, 1857.

Mr _____

SIR,—A number of earnest Radical Abolitionists (Gerrit Smith and others) have suggested the importance of holding a National Convention of Radical Abolitionists, as early as convenient the present year, to take counsel, to devise, to plan, to organise, to provide means, and lay out the work for extended and vigorous operations, and among other things, and especially, to consider and decide whether it is best to make, forthwith, a Presidential Nomination for 1860, or whether it is best to take previous measures of preparation, by the diffusion of light, for a nominating convention at an early day. Inasmuch as there are differences of opinion respecting such a Convention, at so early a period, it has been thought best to invite those who are in favor of it, and *who will pledge themselves to attend it*, to sign the paper annexed, procure other signatures to the same, and return it *previous to the 10th of April next*. Such a Convention, when held, ought to be attended by THOUSANDS, and from at least all the free States. Yet if FIVE HUNDRED NAMES, from nearly all of those states, shall be seasonably signed, as above, to said pledge, the call will then be issued.

Answers should be addressed to Wm. Goodeli, Box 1212, 48 Beekman St. N. York.

WILLIAM GOODELL, Committee.

~~The~~ The day of the month will be determined upon, and inserted in the call, if issued.

PLEDGE.

The undersigned, believing in the Constitutional duty of the American people and Government to abolish American slavery, do hereby *agree and pledge ourselves to attend a National Convention at Rochester, N. Y.* on Wednesday and Thursday, June 10th & 11th, 1857, for the promotion of that object ; and particularly to act on the question whether a Presidential Nomination for 1860 be forthwith made, or whether it be deferred to some time to be then determined upon.— And we authorise the appending of our names to a Call for such a Convention.

GENERAL CATALOGUE OF BOOKS

PAMPHLETS, &c.

*For sale at the Abolition Depository, 48
Beekman St. New York. Terms Cash.*

Those who send money for books to be sent by mail, will please add the postage. Orders to be addressed to "William Goodell, 48 Beekman Street, N. Y."

BOOKS.

	Wholesale,	Retail,	Postage, pre-paid.
American Slave Code, by William Goodell	\$ 50	\$ 75	17
Autographs for Freedom	63	1 00	12
Autobiography of a Female Slave	67	1 00	17
Battle-Scars, or Liberty overthrown	75	1 00	21
Browning, Walter, or the Slave's Protector	16	20	5
Burns, Anthony	50	75	17
Bible Servitude—E Smith of Ohio	40	50	10
Barnes on Slavery	40	50	15
Brishane " " In Cloth	31	38	5
" " " Paper	18	25	4
Chapter The—by F H C	25	38	8
Congregationalism and Church Action—by John Keep	18	25	4
Colored Patriots of the Am. Revolution	85	1 60	18
Died, a Tale of the Great Dismal Swamp: By Harriet Beecher Stowe, in 2 vols.	1 17	1 75	36
Democracy of Christianity, by Wm. Goodell in two vols.	1 00	1 50	32
Evidence on the Slave Trade	22	25	6
Fact: for Baptist Churches	16	75	12
Freeman's (O. S.) Letters on Slavery, a very valuable work	28	38	5
" " " in paper	20	25	3
Gospel Fruits—a premium Essay—by Mrs. Maria Goodell Frost	31	35	7
Grosvenor's Review of Fuller and Wayland	25	37	6
" " " in paper	18	25	4
Gertrude Lee, or the Northern Cousin	20	25	5
God against Slavery	60	75	15
Harriet and Ellen, or the Orphan Girls	20	25	5
Home in the South	20	25	5
Higher Law—by Wm Hosmer, with Portrait of Ex Gov Seward	40	50	10
Jay's Miscellaneous Writings, containing Judge Jay's principal Anti-Slavery Works*	75	1 00	27
Journey through Texas—Olmstead	58	1 25	26
Key to Uncle Tom's Cabin in cloth	60	75	21
" " " paper	40	50	14
Law and Government—By Harmon Kingsbury	38	50	10
Letters on Africa, by Geo Thompson	27	30	6
Legion of Liberty	40	50	13
My Bondage and My Freedom—F. Douglass	75	1 25	19
Memoir of Levi Spencer, by J Blanchard	22	25	6
North and South	40	50	9
Phelps' Letters to Stowe and Bacon	28	38	9
Proceedings of Anti Slavery Convention 1841 & 43	38	50	18
Review of the Mexican War, by Jay	56	75	15
Seaboard Slave States—Olmstead	58	1 25	27
Smith G. Gerrit, in Congress	66	80	16
Struggle for Slavery Extension or Restriction in the U. S.—H. A. Greeley	35	50	8
Slave Trade—Domestic and Foreign—By H C Carey	75	1 00	18
Slavery and Anti Slavery, Histy of—By Goodell	75	1 00	30
Tribute for the Negro. Vindication of their Moral, Intellectual, and Religious Capabilities	80	1 00	38
The Kidnapped and the Ransomed, or Forty Years in Slavery	75	1 25	19
Twelve Years in Slavery, the Narrative of Solomon Northup	67	1 00	17
The Harp of Freedom—Geo. W. Clark	75	1 00	16
Unconstitutionality of Slavery—Spooner	66	75	12

PAMPHLETS.

Abolition Documents	No. 2	per hundred	100	1 pr. oz.
do	3	do	50	..
do	4	do	1 50	..
Amanda—A Tale by Fr Brisbane	6		10	2
American Slavery, a formidable obstacle to the conversion of the World—Prize Essay by Wm Goodell	3		6	1
American Slavery and American Christianity containing Dr Leikus' sermon, Jay on Tract Society, Jackson American Missionary Association and letter on Dropping a Book from the catalogue of the American Sunday School Union	6		10	2
Am. Tract Soc. Apologies, Review of	4		6	2
Anti Slavery Manual—by John G Fee	15		25	5
Black Code of District of Columbia	19		15	3
Calumny refuted by Facts from Liberia	5		7	1
Cassius M Clay's Appeal to Christians	1-2		1	1
Carlin's Narrative	3		6	1
Christian's Business—By Geo Thompson, of Africa	2		3	1
Conditions of Living—By James C Jackson	1-2		1	
Constitutional Duty of the Federal Government to abolish Slavery,	2		2	1
Const n U. S. with a Lecture by D. L. Foster	8		10	3
Cons. of U. S. vs. Slavery	pr. hundred		1 00	1 pr. oz.
Constitution of the U. S.—All the Acts of Congress relating to Slavery. &c.	9		15	2
Documents—Fugitive Slave Bill, &c &c &c	1		2	1
Emmulsion Family—Harr et G. W. Howe	6		12	..
Facts and Facts of the Times—G. W. Perkins	3		6	
Facts and Opinions on Colonization Society; its Real Origin, Character and Influence	31		37	1
Facts in Life of Gen Taylor	4		6	1
"Faustic"—Perns of Peter Pliant	6		10	2
Free Mission Principle—By Edwin R Warren	2		3	1
Fugitive Slave Law—By Rev Joseph P Thompson	6		8	2
Granger's Speech on the Constitution	1		2	1
Great Issue—History of Free Soil Question	6		10	6
Headlands in Life of Henry Clay	1		2	1
History of Division in Anti Slavery Societies	4		6	1
Holley (Myron) History of Movement	4		6	1
Kan-a Struggle of 1856 in Congress, and in the Presidential Campaign	10			

* In the *National Era*, the price was advertised somewhat lower but considering the size and value of the book, it cannot be afforded less than these prices.

Law versus Slavery	50cts per hundred	1	1
Liberty Tracts—per hundred		25	6
Life of Lovejoy	23	37	9
Musical Laws of Servitude—By Judge Jay	8	12	3
Paper presented to General Anti Slavery Convention		1	1
Parker and Root's Discussion	18	25	4
Platforms of the Political Parties	1	2	1
Politics and the Pulpit, from Journal of Commerce and Independent	7	10	2
Remonstrance of Evangelical Alliance	4	6	1
Remedy for Duelling	1	2	1
Reproof of the American Church—By Bishop of Oxford	6	10	3
Report of Committee of Congregational Ministers of Mass.	3	6	1
“ of Am. & For. Anti Slavery Society for 1847. & 52	8	12	2
“ “ “ for 1849-50-51 & 53	18	25	3
Reviewer Reviewed—By Chas G Finney	6	10	3
Sabbath Scene—By Whittier	12	18	2
Scriptural Argument—McKeen's	5	8	1
Slave Catcher Caught—By Asa Rand	8	12	2
Slaveholding proved to be just and right	12	1	1
South Bend Fugitive Slave Case	4	6	1
Spiritual Manifestations—Beecher	12	18	2
Tobacco Trade—Alcot & Grimshaw	3	5	1
Uncle Tom's Cabin—in German,	38	50	10

SPEECHES.

Address to Anti Slavery Christians
of Colored Citizens of New York
per hundred
Beecher on the Fugitive Slave Law
Calhoun
Canada and Jamaica
Denials in Congress
Douglass' Oration
Giddings on Baltimore Platforms
Julian
Just Rulers—Couch
Landmark of Freedom—Sumner
Mann on the Slave Trade
Mass. Liberty Convention
Perkins "Our Country's Sin"
Seward on Const.
South and North
Sumner's "Freedom, National—Slavery
Sectional"
Stevens on California
Southern and Western Liberty Convention
Townsend

LETTERS.

Clarke (John) to J. Sturge on Jamaica
Channing to Clay
Jay to Frelinghuysen
" " Nelson
" " Silliman Ives
Phelps " Stowe and Bacon

ENGRAVINGS.

Bibb, Henry
Birney James G.
Cinque
Clarkson Thomas
Hale John P
Lundy, Benjamin
Stowe, Harriet Beecher
Conquering prejudices to save the Union
Effects of the Fugitive Slave Law
Nubian Slave

MUSIC.

Little Eva

SPECIAL LIST

The following (included in the preceding catalogue) are specially adapted to define and vindicate the distinctive principles and measures of the American Abolition Society, viz.

1. "PROCEEDINGS OF THE SYRACUSE CONVENTION."—The balance of the second edition, about 600 copies, will be intrusted, singly, to each person sending a three cent post office stamp, to prepay the postage. This offer is made to hasten and equalize the circulation, and accommodate those of small means. "First come—first served."

2. "THE CONSTITUTIONAL DUTY of the Federal Government to Abolish American Slavery: an expose of the position of the Abolition Society at New York city and vicinity. 18 pages. 18mo. 2 cts.

3. **ABOLITION DOCUMENTS. NO. 1. PRINCIPLES AND MEASURES.** Declaration of the Convention of Radical Political Abolitionists at Syracuse. 2 pages. of the size and form of Congressional Documents. Price 25 cents per hundred.

4. Spooner's "Unconstitutionality of Slavery." First and Second Part, and Defence of Fugitive Slaves with Appendix. 294 pp. 8vo. in paper—is now for sale at this office, at 75 cents, or postage prepaid 86 cents.

5. **LETTERS ON SLAVERY.** [By O S Freeman.] "Addressed to pro-slavery men in America, showing its illegality in all ages and nations, its destructive war upon society and government, morals and religion." 108 pp. Price 25 cents in paper, or 37 1-2 in cloth.

6. **THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES**, with a LECTURE by Daniel Foster. Showing that a fair interpretation and application of said Constitution will abolish Slavery and establish Liberty 62 pp. Price ten cents.

7. **ABOLITION DOCUMENTS, No. 2. The Constitution against Slave**
ry. Speech of Gen. Granger in Congress. Retail price two cents
dollar per hundred. Postage one cent.

8. ADDITION DOCUMENTS. No. 3. Law versus Slavery. (Extract from eminent writers on Law.) Retail price one cent, or fifty cents per hundred. Postage one cent per ounce.

9. **ABOLITION DOCUMENTS, No. 4. Voting on Principle.**—Letter of Saml. McFarland. Price 2 cents per copy, or 1 50 per hundred. Postage 1 cent per oz.

10. THE KANSAS STRUGGLE OF 1856 in Congress and in the Presidential Campaign, with suggestions for the future. 80 pp. Price 1, cents. Postage 4 cents.

GERRIT SMITH IN CONGRESS.

"Slavery has no right but to die!"

A work of OVER 400 PAGES, containing all his speeches delivered in Congress—also an accurate likeness.

PRICE, ONLY 80 CENTS per copy, and postage paid.

Name.	State and P. O. Address
-------	-------------------------